UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,633	07/15/2003	Brian G. Payton	SVL920030074US1/3794P	1713

45728   7590   01/08/2009
IBM ST-SVL
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
2465 E. Bayshore Road, Suite No. 406
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
LONG, ANDREA NATAE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@sawyerlawgroup.com

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>10/620,633</td><td>PAYTON ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Andrea N. Long</td><td>2176</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 October 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *44-61* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *44-61* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:
       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Responses dated 10/16/2008, Applicant amended claims 44 and 48, claims

61 was added, and argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated

09/03/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this
or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 44-55 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Jarzebowicz et al "Creating SQL Queries the Easy Way with SQL Assist for DB2 UDB

Version 8.1", (November 6, 2002), hereinafter "Jarzebowicz".

*For the convenience of the Applicant, the Examiner has pointed out particular references
contained in the prior art(s) of record in the body of this action. Although the specified citations
are representations of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within
the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. The Applicant should
consider the entire reference(s) as applicable as to the limitations of the claims.*

As to independent claim 44, Jarzebowicz teaches a method for creating a query search

condition through a user interface (page 1), the method comprising:

displaying column names that are selectable for use in a predicate of the query search

condition in a first display area of the user interface (page 3-4, Figure 4 – Column

"WORKDEPT");

displaying column operators that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query

search condition in a second display area of the user interface (page 3-4, Figure 4 - Operator

"IN");

receiving selection of one of the column names displayed in the first display area of the

user interface (page 3-4, Figure 4 – Column area allows for a drop down of a list of columns that

a user can select);

receiving selection of one of the column operators displayed in the second display area of

the user interface (page 3-4, Figure 4 – Operator area allows for a drop down of a list of

operators that a user can select);

automatically generating a list of all column values that are selectable for use in the

predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column names and the selected

column operator (page 8 2nd paragraph – "Find values" feature);

displaying the list of all column values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the

query search condition in a third display are of the user interface (Figure 6 - Value, page 8);

the first display area, the second display area, and the third display area being displayable

together in the user interface (Figure 6);

receiving selection of at lest two displayed predicates in the query search condition (page

8 last paragraph); and

grouping the selected predicates based on a user selection of a displayed grouping

control, the grouping controlling the order in which the selected predicates are evaluated with

respect to at least one unselected predicate of the query search condition (page 8 paragraphs 3-5)

As to dependent claim 45, Jarzebowicz teaches receiving selection of one or more of the column values displayed in the third display area of the user interface (page 3-4 and 8, Figure 6 – Value area allows for a drop down of a list of values that a user can select)

As to dependent claims 46, 47 and 55, Jarzebowicz teaches confirming selection of the selected column name, the selected column operator, and the one or more selected column values by receiving user input clicking a mouse button in the user interface (Figures 4 and 6 – ">" "<" buttons).

As to dependent claims 48 and 54, Jarzebowicz teaches forming the predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column name, the selected column operator, and the one or more selected column values and adding the predicate to the query search condition (page 3-4);

displaying the query search condition and the predicate in a fourth display area of the user interface as one of a plurality of displayed predicates of the query search condition, the selection of at least two predicates being from the displayed query search condition (pages 3-4 and 8-9, Figures 4-6 – Search Condition),

the first display area, the second display area, the third display area, and the fourth display area being displayable together in the user interface (Figure 6).

As to dependent claim 49, Jarzebowicz teaches updating a query model with the predicate of the query search condition (page 4));

displaying SQL code of the query model in a fifth display area of the user interface, the

first display area, the second display area, the third display area, the fourth display area, and the

fifth display are being displayable together in the user interface (Figure 4).

As to dependent claims 50, 51, 52, and 53, Jarzebowicz teaches wherein the column

names, column operators, column values, and are selectable for use in the predicate of the query

search condition in pull down menus (Figures 4 and 6, page 8).

As to dependent claim 61, Jarzebowicz teaches wherein the at least two selected

predicates and the query search condition are displayed as text in a displayed window, and

wherein the grouping control is enabled for user selection only in response to the user selecting

the at least two predicates as a number of text rows of the displayed query search condition that

have a same spatial level being relative to an edge of the displayed window displaying the query

search condition (page 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 56-57 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarzebowicz in view of Goldberg et al (US Patent 6496833 B1), hereinafter "Goldberg".

As to dependent claim 56, Jarzebowicz teaches forming a query statement based on, at least in part, the query search condition and selections in the user interface and processing the query statement into a form defined by a query model (Page 4), the processing including: using a plurality of content viewers to interface to an application that uses the user interface an to process the query statement into query information independent of a specific structure, including : using a particular one of a plurality of API-specific content viewers to interface with a particular GUI API used by the application , each API specific content viewer useable with an associated one of a plurality of different available graphical user interface APIs; and using a non-specific content viewer in communication with the API-specific content viewers to provide the query information (page 4-5 work on existing SQL query, regardless of the tool or editor used to create it). However Jarzebowicz does not forcefully teach the using a model content provider to receive the query information and translate the query information into the form defined by the query model, the form including item provider objects that are instances of query model elements of the query model and that include query model relationships of the query model.

Goldberg teaches using a model content provider to receive the query information and translate the query information into the form defined by the query model, the form including item provider objects that are instances of query model elements of the query model and that

include query model relationships of the query model (Figures 5 and 7, col 7 line 14 – col 8 line 67).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the model content provider of Goldberg with the query processing of Jarzebowicz to allow for translation of the query information regardless of the tool or editor used to create it.

As to dependent claim 57, Jarzebowicz teaches constructing a query statement but does not forcefully teach wherein each of the API-specific content viewers processes item provider objects provided by the model content provider for structures specific to the associated GUI API. Goldberg teaches wherein each of the API-specific content viewers processes item provider objects provided by the model content provider for structures specific to the associated GUI API (column 5 lines 44-64).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the forming of a query statement to include the processing of the query statement of Goldberg to automate the generation of query objects to allow for portability between different DBMS servers.

As to dependent claim 59, Jarzebowicz teaches constructing a query statement. Jarzebowicz does not teach using a model content provider to receive the query information. Goldberg teaches wherein using the model content provider to receive the query information and translator the query information into the form defined by the query model further comprises:

adding at least one proxy item provider object to the form to replace at least one reference

to at least one other form defined by the query model (column 7 lines 14-49), and

reestablishing the at least one reference to the form defined by the query model after code

is generated from the form (column 7 lines 14 to column 8 line 67).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the forming of a query statement to include the processing of the query statement of

Goldberg to automate the generation of query objects to allow for portability between different

DBMS servers.

As to dependent claim 60, Jarzebowicz teaches constructing a query statement.

Jarzebowicz does not teach translating the query information into the form defined by the query

model. Goldberg teaches creating the item provider objects dynamically as the query statement

is formed (column 3 lines 14-25).

**Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarzebowicz
in view of Goldberg in further view of Banning et al (US Patent 5421008), hereinafter
"Banning".**

As to dependent claim 58, note the discussion of claim 56 above. Jarzebowicz teaches

constructing a query statement. Jarzebowicz does not teach processing the query statement into

the form in accordance with the query model by creating a tree structure. Goldberg teaches

processing the query statement into the form in accordance with query model. Banning teaches

selecting a query element of the query statement for modeling from a plurality of query elements

in the query statement; identifying at least one type associated with the selected query element;

defining a parent node representing the selected query element; defining a child node for the

parent node for each of the identified at least one types; and examining each of the child nodes to

determine one or more subtypes of the child nodes; defining a subtype child node of each child

node for each of the determined subtypes; and using the defined parent node, child node, and

subtype child nodes to create a tree structure representative of the selected query element

(Figures 5-7, col 9 line 28 to col 10 line 44).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

have combined the teachings of Jarzebowicz and Goldberg with that of Banning to provide for

interactively querying a model in a manner which is time efficient and element precise.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 44 has been considered but is moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrea N Long/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176